

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 and 20-29 are now pending in the application. Claim 1 is amended herein. Claims 20-29 are added herein. Support for the claim amendment and the new claims can be found in at least the figures and in original claims 11-18. No new matter is added. Claims 11-18 are cancelled herein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 3, and 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Denham et al. (GB Pat. App. No. 2401661, hereinafter referred to as "Denham"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is not anticipated by the Denham reference because the Denham reference does not disclose forming heat-weakened regions in each of said at least two workpieces and driving the blind rivet through the resultant heat-weakened regions in each of the at least two work pieces. Rather, the Denham reference specifically discloses that when utilized with two or more workpieces, as shown in Figures 5A-5E, the first workpiece 45 that faces the non-blind side has a preformed hole 47 therein to accommodate the rivet body while the second workpiece 46 facing the blind side does not and can be penetrated/driven through by the blind rivet. As such, the Denham reference only discloses the rotation of a rivet while applying a biasing force to drive through only one of the at least two workpieces. As such, the Denham reference does not disclose the subject matter of claim 1.

Moreover, the Denham reference does not contemplate nor provide motivation to form heat-weakened regions in each of the at least two workpieces and driving the blind rivet through the resulting heat-weakened regions in each of at least two workpieces. Rather, the Denham reference specifically discloses that when two workpieces are positioned adjacent one another, the first or closest workpiece to the working side has a preformed hole 47 such that only a single workpiece is to be penetrated/driven through.

Accordingly, for at least this reason it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 along with dependent claims 3 and 7-10 are not anticipated by the Denham reference and withdrawal of the instant rejection is requested.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 2 and 4-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denham. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, claims 2 and 4-6 all depend from claim 1 which is patentable for at least the reasons stated above. Accordingly, for at least these same reasons it is respectfully submitted that claims 2 and 4-6 are also patentable and withdrawal of the instant rejection is requested.

#### **NEW CLAIMS**

New claims 20-29 are added herein. It is respectfully submitted that new claims 20-29 further define patentable subject matter. As such, allowance of new claims 20-29 is requested.

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 17, 2009

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

JHU/pl

14737641.1

By:   
Jeffery H. Urian, Reg. No. 46,232